Khalid
17 10 33

ان الدين عند الله الاسلام

The REVIEW of RELIGIONS

Edited by Ghulam Farid Malik, M. A.

Vol. XXXII OCTOBER, 1933 No. 10

CONTENTS

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

	Pages
THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION —Dr. M. S. Nawaz Khan ...	505
INDIA'S DEBT TO ISLAM ...	519
THE PROPHET'S LAST PUBLIC SPEECH ...	523
THE PROPHET'S MARRIAGE WITH ZAINAB ...	525
PROPHETS *Vs.* SCIENTISTS ...	530
NOTES AND COMMENTS— Get back to your Kitchens—Hindus and the Communal Award—What is Wrong with Christian Missions in Africa ...	540
NOTES ON THE HOLY QURAN —Maulana Sher Ali ...	545

Head Office :
QADIAN,
Punjab : India.

Branch Office :
THE LONDON MOSQUE,
63, Melrose Road, Southfields, London, 18, S. W.

AHMAD

AND

HIS TEACHINGS

IN HIS OWN WORDS

A volume of 300 pages shall be supplied Post Free on receipt of stamps worth annas eight or Money Order.

The Secretary,

ANJUMAN-I-TARRAQI-I-ISLAM, Secunderabad, (Dn.)

IF . .

YOU WANT TO KNOW

What Islam Stands for, what is its message for humanity, how does it seek to raise man from the lowest depths of degradation to the highest pinnacles of glory—economically, morally & spiritually

READ

AHMADIYYAT OR THE TRUE ISLAM

BY

Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad

HEAD OF THE AHMADIYYA COMMUNITY AND THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORITY ON ISLAM

The book deals in a simple and lucid manner, briefly but fully and completely, with all the different aspects of the teachings of Islam.

BOOK DEPOT, QADAIN, Pb., India

The
Review of Religions

Vol. XXXII OCTOBER, 1933 No. 10

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

بسم اللہ الرحمن الرحیم

نحمدہ ونصلی علی رسولہ الکریم

In the name of Allah, the most Beneficent and the most Merciful
We praise Him and invoke His blessings upon
His exalted Prophet.

" A prophet came unto the world and the world accepted him not, but God shall accept him and establish his truth with mighty signs."

THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION

(DR. M. S. NAWAZ KHAN, M. B., B. S., ZANZIBAR.)

Islam teaches us that all the religious systems of the world had Divine revelation as the common basis from which they originated. There have been 'Reformers' and 'Warners' in every country and every nation, in ancient times, who were the direct recipients of revelation from God, and this revelation, *viz.* the 'Word' of God, formed the foundation of their respective religions.

Science and Philosophy have had an age-long conflict with Religion. Scientists have always been attempting to refute religious beliefs and dogmas, though they could not achieve any great measure of success. There cannot be any conflict between 'true' religion and 'true' science, since religion is the 'Word' of God and science the 'Work' of God. Recent advances in modern knowledge are manifesting and shall continue to manifest, in future, the truth of this statement. Accordingly,

with the prominence of Llyod Morgan's theory of 'Emergent' evolution, the old purely mechanistic views of nature have been shaken and the pendulum has now swung in the direction of vitalist theories, which may serve as a basis of renewed co-operation between science and religion. The scientists are, therefore, very cautious, at present, in making any dogmatic statement about religious experience, and a state of compromise exists between science and theology, as a result of toleration and better mutual understanding between them.

But, in general literature, as a result of the efforts of some quasi-scientists, who have been appropriately called the 'camp followers of science', a good deal is credited to the domain and achievements of science, which the scientists themeselves do not claim. Great hopes are being entertained by them, that, in the near future religion shall be closely examined by science and particularly Philosophy and no compromise shall be possible unless religion has ceded some of its territory to science. But a study of recent and contemporary Philosophy shows that it would not be so. The hostility between Philosophy and theology is over, and among British philosophers indeed the number of defenders of the faith seems very large.

In spite of this general friendly relationship between science and religion, a new attempt has been made, in recent years, by some psychologists and particularly the 'Freudians' to undermine the very foundation of religion and thus destroy its value and sanctity which it has enjoyed for centuries. They have made an endeavour to formulate an all-embracing theory which would explain that religion like any other human institution has been evolved, *viz.*, the religion of man has undergone a sort of development along with his mental and social evolution. There are two main theories that have been made prominent in recent advances of psychology, in which an attempt has been made to trace the origin of religion to certain alleged pre-religious sources.

(*i*) *The Theory of Fear-Reaction.*—According to this theory it is alleged that the idea of religion originated as a result of fear, which primitive man entertained in his mind when he came in contact with untamed and unsympathetic nature. Man was quite unarmed and unsafe during the primitive stages of his savage

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

life and it was quite natural for him to develop ideas of fear and awe, regarding the powers of nature, and his inability to master it. Hence, in order to 'survive' in the keen 'struggle for existence,' he naturally needed the sympathy of nature, which he tried to gain by humiliating himself before it, and thus the idea of worship originated.

Animal worship ('Animism') was the beginning of man's religious consciousness, in a primitive stage of civilization. Later on, with the growth of mental faculties these animals were considered the 'images' or symbols, of certain deities whose powers and attributes they manifested and thus animism gave rise to polytheism. The ultimate goal of this theistic evolution was monotheism, since polytheism could not survive the growth of moral consciousness and critical intelligence of civilized man.

(*ii*) *The Theory of Repressed Sex Instincts.*—This theory was formulated by S. Freud as a result of his studies in Psycho-Analysis. This theory, though far-fetched in its conclusions, is very interesting and seems all-embracing, and it is hoped that it will revolutionize the whole systems of psychology, philosophy and social anthropology.

Freud alleges that the sex-instinct ('Libido') is the basis of all our civilization, culture, behaviour, morality, religious beliefs and social conventions, and the foundation of these is laid in early infancy. Freud calls an infant a 'polymorphous pervert'. He has made a definite attempt to trace the origin of religious practices to this instinct. He alleges that man is by nature far more immoral (considering the repressed desires) than he believes, and he is a mere set of selfish desires, mostly sexual and aggressive in nature. With the advance in civilization and morality, man had to sacrifice most of his animal desires and tendencies, in order to establish a stable and peaceful society. This renunciation of desires naturally involved a certain amount of strain on the mind of primitive man, which he would not tolerate, without adequate compensation. A Divine personality was thus 'invented,' who could compensate for this sacrifice.

Apart from that, Freud has also attempted to link certain religious practices and rites with certain symbols indicating various sexual tendencies under repression, which could not find

adequate outlet in their original wicked form, and hence took a disguised form of rites and conventions, in order to satisfy these desires with authority and sanctity. He has also made these inferences from his observations on the use of certain sex-symbols in worship and sex imagery in expressing religious emotions. He is trying to explain most of our rites and conventions in the light of sex emotions and the day is not distant when such noble and sublime practices as the slaughter of animals (sacrifice) for religious purposes and the sacrifice of life for the cause of Truth and freedom of conscience (martyrdom) shall perhaps be considered by Freud as mere manifestations of latent 'sadism' (sexual satisfaction by inflicting pain on the love-object) and 'masochism' (sexual satisfaction by enduring pain himself).

(*iii*) Social and economic irregularity is also considered by some communist philosophers as a basis of the origin of religion. It is based on the assumption, that rich people instead of parting with some of their riches and distributing them among the poor, invented the idea of 'God' who was responsible for their social, and economic inferiority and who would reward them, in the 'hereafter,' for their poverty in this world.

This theory appears quite inadequate in the face of true facts and does not deserve any serious consideration, since it is apparent that social and economic inequality did not exist in the beginning of man's social life. It was a later manifestation caused by the growing needs of men and their consequent 'struggle for existence'. Hence this theory cannot explain the origin. It may give some insight into the so-called religious practices of some individuals in the aristocratic sections of humanity, who advocate 'capitalism'.

The theories of fear-reaction and sex-repression seem very interesting and all-embracing, but in fact they do not explain any thing. They 'explain away' every thing and, therefore in the end, explain nothing. Anyhow, they do not explain the origin of religion at all. They may throw some light on the incentives (unconscious motives) of the present day degenerated forms of 'religious' practices and the conduct of some nations and individuals, in savage as well as civilized circles, who, on account of ignorance, unconscious mental conflicts and perhaps convenience attribute

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

their practices and behaviour to their religion, in order to carry them out with authority.

Now let us examine these theories in some detail, as to how far they help us, in tracing the origin of religion to its alleged pre-religious sources.

I—The Theory of Fear-Reaction

According to this theory, the beginning of religion was in the form of animal worship, which eventually gave birth to polytheism and ultimately to monotheism as a result of the growth of man's moral consciousness. This theory, as shall be explained in the end, is based on a wrong hypothesis, since the available records of the beginnings of morals and culture of ancient nations show that monotheism was their original religion. Islam also teaches us, that the morality and culture of nations has always heen primarily based on monotheism, as revealed by God, through His Messengers, and polytheism, animism, pantheism, atheism, acosmism and scores of other 'isms' were secondary manifestations, resulting from disintegration of man's moral consciousness, in his vain attempts to interpret the pure and untempered with 'word' of God (revelation) with the help of intelligence alone.

Locke, in his polemic against the argument of religious experience of nations (Consensu Gentium), *viz.*, the idea of God is 'innate' in the human mind, asks, what idea of God is innate and he thinks that the argument collapsed, since the conceptions of the divine held by savages, differ profoundly from those of civilized nations. For his information I answer his question by asserting that one and only one idea of Divine (God) is innate and was innate in human mind, in which there was complete agreement between the conceptions of the Divine held by savages and clvilized nations, *viz.*, monotheism. It is true, that at present, no two conceptions of the existence of God are alike, but this difference of views is due to the different interpretations that have been given to monotheism by the critical intelligence of philosophers, both ancient and modern.

A close study of the beginnings of morals and culture (social anthropology) of nations whose records are so far available, shows that monotheism has always preceded polytheism. Western

writers on comparative religion, through lack of data regarding the beginnings of morals and culture in ancient times, assert, that monotheism is a late development in the history of religious thought. Even eminent authorities on religion, like Rev. Prof. W. R. Matthews, D. D. have accepted the view that montheism is the outcome of evolution in man's religious thought, quite unaware of the fact that if religion is also proved to be an evolved institution like other social institutions and conventions, it will lose its authority and sanctity as a binding and holy code, for the guidance of humon conduct. He says*:—"Monotheism is a comparatively late development in the history of religious thought. Some students of comparative religion have indeed held that man began with a primitive monotheism, and so great is our ignorance of religious beginnings, that it would be unscientific to deny the possibility of this view. On the whole, however, it seems more probable that the religious beliefs of mankind were in the first instance a vague conception of nature, as animated by "spirits"—that man's first creed was 'animism.' From this starting-point it is not difficult to conjecture, how the belief in 'gods' arose, and the passage from animism to polytheism may in fact be traced with a high degree of probability."

Now, let us discuss the philosophical aspect of the theory of fear-reaction and see, to what extent it can satisfy our critical intelligence :

(1) *Evidence of Human Nature*

A study of human nature reveals the fact, that there are two great incentives to obedience, namely love and fear. A great majority of human beings, both savage and civilized are moved to respect and obedience by love, and a small minority responds to fear. The theory that fear was the first motive of man's worship of nature is not only based on a wrong hypothesis but is at the same time not all-embracing, since it does not account for the worship of harmless animals. Take for instance, the cow. The Egyptians whose civilization is considered very ancient used to worship the cow, (and in India it is still worshipped) not on account of fear that it inspired in their minds

* *An Outline of Modern Knowledge*, p. 55.

but on account of its great usefulness to primitive agricultural man.

Besides, if man began to worship nature, on account of fear, he should naturally have been afraid, and hence started worship of those objects which attracted his attention in the first instance. It is very probable that primitive man saw the sun, the moon and the stars and began to wonder at their movements, earlier than the wild animals. Hence it was natural for him to commence worship of the heavenly bodies earlier than the wild animals. But we find that worship of the stars is not so old as that of wild animals. Again, amongst the wild animals it is very likely that man came in contact with the carnivora earlier than the reptiles. Hence in the ordinary course of events, the lions and tigers should have instilled fear in the mind of pre-historic man, prior to the snake, since the lion is bigger in size, it roars and attacks the enemy in an open combat, while the snake on the other hand is small in size and bites unawares. Lion worship should therefore have preceded snake worship but on the contrary we find that snake worship is more ancient and more wide-spread than lion worship.

(2) *Evidence of the Theory of Evolution*

The theory of evolution also refutes the idea that man began to worship animals as a result of fear. The theory of fear-reaction can only fit the idea of worship if it is at the same time admitted that man was 'created' on the face of the globe, all of a sudden and he began to fear wild animals, because he was not acquainted with them before. But this conception would at once imply the existence of a Divine personality who purposely 'created man,' as an independent and individual unit, and the theory of evolution would be automatically refuted. But the biologist is not prepared to admit that man was created suddenly.

If man came into existence as a result of slow evolution, in thousands of centuries and had undergone phylogenetic changes in his body, he could not be afraid of wild animals. The biologist tells us that primitive man has been 'adapting' himself to his environment and has been 'surviving' by dint of his superior mental equipment, hence the wild animals were not strangers to him. When it is asserted that the ancestors of man (the anthropoied apes) have

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

been struggling for existences with some, and ignoring some of the wild animals, how could they possibly begin to worship them when their mental and moral consciousness had begun to evolve. It is ridiculous to believe that primitive man, who had gallantly subdued the wild animals, after a hard and lengthy struggle for existence, began to fear and worship them, when he possessed better physical and mental equipment. By formulating the theory of fear reaction, as basis of man's religious beginnings, the psychologists have put the scientists in a dilemma. If the thoery of evolution is right, the theory of fear-reaction is wrong, if the latter is right the former is wrong.

(3) *Evidence of Social Anthropology.*

It has been stated before that the assertion that 'animism' has been the precurser of monotheism, is only a conjecture based on a wrong and insufficent hypothesis. The scientists themselves admit that they are ignorant of man's religious beginnings. However, the few available records of the history of morals and culture of ancient nations clearly show that the belief in one God (monotheism) was their ancient religion. An account of the ancient religion of some savage nations is given below for the information of interested readers :—

(*i*) *Mexico.*—The ancient inhabitants of Mexico are considered to be the most primitive of surviving savage nations. A study of the records of the beginnings of their morals and culture shows that they believe in one God, whom they call 'Awona-Wilona'. The account given in their scriptures of tbe creation of the universe and man, agrees with the first chapter of the Bible (Genesis) and is also supported by the modern conceptions of Cosmogony.

(*ii*) *Africa.*—The mental capacity of the natives of some parts of Africa is so low, that they forget every thing in their old age that is taught to them in youth. Their civilization and culture is so primitive that, despite the fast spread of western civilization, as a result of the admirable efforts of Christian missionaries in the heart of the Dark Continent, they still go about naked. But they also believe in one God who is considered Omnipotent, Omniscient and Omnipresent. I have also made a personal inquiry into their ancient beliefs about religion, during my stay

in Uganda, and have found that all the different tribes irrespective of their grade of civilization, unanimously believe in one God, the angels, the soul, and its survival of bodily death. Although at present, they are very superstitious, and believe in Fetishism, *viz.*, witch-craft, evil spirits, charms, etc., but they were all originally monotheists. The names of some of the savage tribes of Uganda with their local names for God, are given below for the information of interested readers : The Acholi tribe calls God in their local dialect, 'Robanga', the Karamojans call, 'Akojo', the Aluru call, 'Robanga' ; Lugwala, 'Adra' ; the Lango, 'Nisae' ; the Muganda, 'Kitonda' ; the Kavirondo, 'Nisae' ; the Sawahili, 'Mungu'.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

A short account of the beliefs of the Lango tribe whose civilization is so low that their women still go about naked, will give the reader an insight into the so-called 'primitive' theology of the savage. The local name for God, in their dialect is, Nisae and His attributes are considered by them analogous with 'Jock', *viz.*, moving air, which is a very clear and instructive analogy. They say that God like moving air, as omnipresent cannot be seen ordinarily. He is only seen in whirlwinds which indicates that like air in motion, God's personality cannot be seen, though His voice can be heard occasionally. His other attributes cannot be seen but they can be percieved by the senses like moving air. They also believe in Angels whom they consider analogous to 'Winvo' *viz.*, a bird. The angels are regarded by them as guardian spirits, attending human beings and animals and are responsible for bringing fortune and luck. The spirit or soul is considered analogous to 'Tipo', *viz.*, shadow or shade of persons, animals and inanimate objects. This analogy is also very philosophical since it indicates that the shadow (Tipo) is indentical with the spiritual part of man and just as, after death man's shadow does not enter the grave similarly the soul is not buried. Shadow is absent in the dark, so the soul also departs in sleep.

(*iii*) *Australia.*—A certain region of Australia was discovered a few centuries ago. The people of this region were entirely cut off from the rest of the world. One of their ancient tribes called 'Arunta' believes in one God whom they call 'Altijra. They believe that 'Altijra' lives in the Heavens and He is so Merciful that He does not like to punish His creatures, and hence it is not necessary to worship Him.

(*iv*) *Babylonia.*—The Babylonian civilization is also very ancient. Their records also show that, they believed in one God. A recent archeological commission has discovered a prayer of one of the kings of Babylonia which clearly shows that he also believed in one God. Similarly the ancient Canadians, the 'Zulus' of South Africa, the ancient Austrians, the ancient Hindus, all of them originally believed in one God, in the beginning of their morality and civilization.

Thus, the evidence of social anthropology which is so far available, clearly shows that the idea of one God was inspired in the beginning, by direct revelation from the Providence and was not 'created' by the growth of man's moral consciousness and critical intelligence.

It may be asked, that the evidence of social anthropology only proves that belief in one God exists in the ancient tribes but what is the proof that this idea itself is also ancient? The proof of it is, that the savage tribes not only believe in one God, but they also believe in Revelation. The Vedas of ancient Hindus are believed to have been revealed to some unknown 'Rishis'. The savage tribes of Austria when they are asked why do they worship their God, say that they have been commanded by Him for doing so. The ancient savages of America also believe in revelation as the means of communication with God.

Evidence of archeology also proves that those nations who are polytheists at present were originally monotheists. Accordingly, an archeological expert has recently shown, that the Chinese whose belief in the plurality of 'gods', exceeds even the proverbial polytheism of India, were originally monotheists.

This clearly shows that the idea of one God was not 'evolved' but it was inspired by revelation from God Himself, through His Messengers, *viz.*, the Prophets of yore. These personalities may be regarded as hypocrites and neurotics, and their experiences may be dismissed as based on a mistake or illusion, or unconsious self-delusion, but the fact remains that the idea of God was revealed and not 'created' by the growth of man's moral consciousness.

II.—The Theory of Repressed Sexual Tendencies

This theory was advanced by S. Freud as a basis of the psycho-analytic conception of sex. Psycho-Analysis is not, and never has been, a theoratically perfect structure. This theory is still incomplete and in transition, since there is much to be solved before it can be finally established. It seems very interesting and impressive because it is so all-embracing. The value that can be claimed by this theory, in explaining the origin of religion and other social institutions, can be judged from the criticism that has been brought against it by eminent psychologists like Dr. W. Brown of Oxford University and Prof. McDougall, which I quote for the satisfaction of those quasi-scientists; more appropriately called 'the camp-followers of science,' who are giving more credit, in modern literature, to the achievements and aspirations of science, than the scientists themselves.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

Prof. William Brown, while bringing criticism of a general scope, against the Freudian system, writes*:—

The whole Freudian system is absolutely bare and lacking in any criterion of truth. Freud himself hardly ever refers to the intellectual side of life..... He makes his observations in the light of certain hypothesis and crudely adjusts and modifies the hypothesis to fit the facts..... Some Freudians undertake to explain æsthetic processes as 'reaction-formations' to sex activity, from moral sources, but they have no criterion of æsthetics. Nor has Freud himself any criterion of morals. Finally he has no criterion of religious experience..... Freud himself holds that the problem of æsthetic processes will be for ever inaccessible to psycho-analytic investigation. (Dr. Earnest Jones).....It is a theory which explains away every thing and therefore in the end explains nothing..... A scientist, however good an investigator he may be, has a tendency to fight for what he thinks to be true, and is anxious to possess the truth, and to hold it against all-comers. The dangers for science of an exaggeration of this tendency, in the direction of extremism and reactionism are as serious as they are certain.

* *Science and Personality*, pp. 115—117.

2. *The Oedipus Complex*

This complex, which means the incestuous fixation of the infant on its parent of the opposite sex, is considered by Freud as the nuclear complex of all psychoneuroses. It is the central feature of all Freudian systems. It has been apporiately called by Dr. Kempf, " the ark of the Freudian covenant." Freud's views have undergone a peculiar 'metamorphosis,' under stress of criticism from contemporary psychologists. In his earlier writings he said that all social customs and institutions, including morality and religion are based on this incestuous fixation of the infant on its parents. Later in his "Group Psychology", he has taught that the sense of guilt (which he makes the root of all morality and religion) is a product of the working of the Œdipus complex. In his recent writings, he says that in course of normal or ideal development the complex becomes eradicated in early childhood, and it persists into adult life only in neurotics. William McDougall,* while bringing criticism against the passing of the Œdipus complex writes:

"Freud thus leaves himself, for the present, in the position that all the vast sociological structure which he has reared on the Œdipus complex is completely deprived of its foundation; or we have to suppose that religion and morality have been built up and are maintained solely by the efforts of infants and neurotics the sole possessors of the Œdipus complex.

There is another great difficulty for the theory, of which Freud seems to have become obscurely aware in recent years; *viz*, the genesis of the complex in the female sex. For, according to Freud's teachings, the male infant acquires the complex primarily and chiefly through the sexual satisfaction which he derives from suckling at his mother's breast. But there is no corresponding possibility for the genesis of the female infant's alleged fixation on the father. And now in the light of Freud's new doctrine another insoluble problem arises, namely, how to account for the destruction of the complex in the normally developing female child; a problem before which Freud himself retires confessing himself at a loss."

---

* *An Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 419.

Besides, since the evidence of the existence of the complex in all infants was found in the dreams of normal adults, and now Freud admits that the complex dies a natural death in all normal adults, therefore there remains no ground for assuming its existence in those infants, who become normal adults.

Incestuous attachment to the parent of the opposite sex is not always due to this natural complex, since in several instances, it has been clearly demonstrated that it was produced as a result of unwise conduct of the parents, during childhood and adolescence.

Besides, the dogma of the universal presence of this complex is against common sense and common experience. Although some cases do occur in which the infants are passionately fond of their parent of the opposite sex and subconsciously hate the parent of the same sex, but a great majority of the cases are also found, in which there is great love and affection for the parent of the same sex. Here the Freudian brings the doctrine of 'ambivalency' for his defence, *viz.*, every love is also hate and every hate is also love. Thus, instances of tender and enduring affection of the child for its parent of the same sex, are adjusted to this theory by inventing another hypothesis, that love displayed in such cases is only a phenomenon of 'over-compensation' for a secret hate that lurks in "the unconscious."

If asked, what is the cause of tender affection of the parent for the child of the same sex we shall perhaps be told by some bold Freudian, that it is due to the homo-sexual component of the sex instinct.

Since Freud himself has admitted, that during the course of normal or ideal development, the Œdipus complex dies a natural death, therefore, no other argument is needed to refute the assertion, that religion and morality are based on repressed sexual tendencies.

It was said in the beginning, that, religion is alleged by some psychologists, to have originated to compensate for the mental strain caused by the conflict between the natural and ideal desires of individuals, (who are considered by Freud as a mere set of most selfish sexual and aggressive instincts) when they were asked to renounce these desires, for the mutual benefit of society.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

In the early days of psycho-analytic movement, there was a tendency to depict human individual as much more immoral or unmoral than he appeared to be. But further investigation in this direction has shown that the individual is also more moral (considering the repressing forces, and the Super-Ego) than he seems.

Since, in normal and ideal development, the Œdipus complex dies a natural death, the repressed desire and the repressing forces of normal human adults are in perfect harmony. Hence there cannot be any conflict between the natural and the ideal desires of normal human adults. When there is no conflict, there would be no mental strain, and hence the necessity of a 'proposed' god, to compensate for the renounced desires, would not arise.

Before closing, it would be quite logical to conclude that the theory of psycho-analysis cannot explain the origin of religion.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

INDIA'S DEBT TO ISLAM

"If ignorance is the curse of God," said Sir P. C. Ray the other day, "caste is equally the curse of God. More than anything else it is at the root of unhappy India's degradation for the last one thousand years and more. It strikes at the root of nationalism."

For more than twelve long centuries Islam has been in contact with Hinduism in India and for more than twelve long centuries its clear, definite, and simple creed that God is One and all mankind equal in His sight has been proclaimed five times a day from the lofty minarets of the Muslim mosques throughout the length and breadth of the country. This clear, definite and simple creed which stands in glaring contrast to the indigenous vagaries of imagination and speculation about God, has appealed during these twelve centuries to many Hindus as a satisfying solution of the vexed problem of theology and has been responsible for the spread of Islam in India. The seed of the idea of the oneness of God and oneness of humanity which now appeals to so many Hindus and which fired the imagination of reformers like Nanak and Kabir, to preach against polytheism in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and then of Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Swami Dyanand in the 19th century was sowed in the soil of India by Islam. The greatness of Nanak, Ram Mohan Roy and Dyanand lay in the fact that they preached against the highly debasing and degrading belief in the plurality of gods and against the immoral bondage of caste. But these great and distinguished religious and social Hindu reformers could find no sanction for their teachings in the religious scriptures of their faith. They borrowed these ideas from Islam and adopted them as their own. That it took Hinduism such a long time to understand and realize the ennobling and elevating Islamic principles is due to the hide-bound conservatism of the Hindus. The Hindu is by nature very conservative. He sticks to his traditions, to his views and beliefs, to his culture and social

practices, with a very stubborn obstinacy even when those beliefs, views and practices are shown to be inconsistent with reason and common sense. Hinduism may or may not acknowledge the great debt it owes to Islam inasmuch as it has learned to recognize the injustice and iniquity of its caste system and the unwisdom of its polytheistic beliefs, but the fact can hardly be denied that the social and religious awakening in India from the fifteenth century to the present day is due to the impact of Islam on Hinduism. Its social evils which were the direct outcome of its religious beliefs stood as unconquerable impediments in the way of India's economic and political progress and development. Islam did it an incalculable service by making it conscious of the degradation to which it was rushing headlong.

But this is not the only way in which Islam wrought a ramarkable change in Hinduism and this is not the only benefit which Hinduism derived from its contact with Islam. Restoration of touch with the outer world, including the revival of an Indian navy and sea-borne trade, both of which had been lost since very remote past, is another very conspicuous commercial and political benefit which the Muslim rule conferred upon India. The Hindus had remained for thousands of years confined within the four walls of their country and knew nothing of the outside world. They even regarded it as a mortal sin to travel on the sea. This ignorance of the advancements and developments that were taking place in other countries and this want of touch with the religious, social and political movements in foreign lands led to the mental and moral, economic and political, decay of the Hindus. The Muslims brought with them their own civilization and culture, their literature, their customs, ways and manners and being the most advanced and refined people of their time the civilizations and cultures of other nations and races entered India following in their wake. Hindustan became conversant with the scientific inventions and discoveries of the Greeks and with their ideas and notions about ethics, morality and sociology, with the ancient lore of the Persians, with the art of war of the Romans and the architecture of the

Chinese and last but not least of all, with the very sublime and noble conception of God—on which all religion and morality are based—that emanated from the desert of Arabia. It became raised in the estimation of the whole world and attracted envoys from as very distant and remote lands as the Islands situated in the extreme northwest of the Northern Hemisphere. Internal peace over a large part of India, especially north of the Vindhyas may be cited as another very conspicuous instance of the boons, benefits and blessings of the Muslim rule. Hindustan, before the advent of Islam, was divided into many small principalities over which ruled rajas and chieftains whose mutual animosities and antagonisms prevented it from welding into one strong and homogenous nation and led to very frequent disturbance of the peace and order of the country. The Muslim rule converted it into one country with a uniform administration and even with uniform social manners and dress among the upper classes irrespective of their religious beliefs and social views.

A very useful and respectable contribution was made by the Muslims to the art, architecture and industries of the country. Indo-Saracen art, in which the medieval Hindu and Chinese schools were blended together, a new style of architecture and industries of a refined variety, such as shawl, muslin and carpet-making owed their existence to the Muslim rule. The Muslim style of architecture has remained unsurpassed in its ingenuity, beauty and perfection and India can rightly boast that its best specimens are to be found in it.

The Taj Mahal is still the last word in architecture. The ruins of Akbar's court at Fatehpur Sikri have continued to fill with wonder and amazement for the last four centuries architects from the ends of the earth. But from the nationalist point of view Islam's greatest service to the cause of Indian nationalism is that the Muslim Monarchs saw the necessity of, and were successful in creating, a common language, a *lingua franca* for the whole country, called Hindustani, Rekhta or Urdu. The idea of a nation without a common language which all parts and sections of the nation can speak and write is an unrealizable dream. India cannot hope to be called one country and one

nation unless it has a common language. The Muslim Princes realized this supreme fact generations ago. They knew that Persian was not the language of the country. It was closely allied to Arabic to which the Hindus were totally foreign. They also realized that the Muslims could not be expected to learn and assimilate Sanskrit. They, therefore, thought of inventing a new language which could be composed of words taken equally from Persian and Sanskrit. That language is Urdu. It is destined to become the *lingua franca* of India. It possesses elasticity and flexibility and the capacity to acquire and assimilate, which qualities are indispensable for a progressive language to possess. Persian has gone out of India, never to return. The Hindus cannot reconcile themselves with Arabic, and Sanskrit is a dead language, fit to be learned only by the Pundits and scholars of the Vedas. It is Urdu, alone of all Indian languages, which is spoken and understood over all parts of the country. It should be made the official language of the country if our leaders wish to see India one strong and powerful nation.

The rise, development and progress of our vernacular literature was the result of the peace and economic prosperity under the Empire of Dehli. Monotheistic religious revival to which we have referred above, historical literature and improvement in the art of war and in civilization in general, were some other benefits which India derived from its contact with Islam. Hundreds of other benefits may easily be counted, but the debt which India owes to Islam—that it introduced in this country a very high and sublime conception of God and awakened it to the realization of the iniquity of its caste-system and that the Muslim monarchs took effective steps to engender a national sense and a national outlook—is such that it can never adequately discharge.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

THE PROPHET'S LAST PUBLIC SPEECH

One day in his last illness the Holy Prophet (peace be with him) mustered sufficient strength to deliver a short speech, which was destined to be his last public discourse and which was, indeed, one of the most remarkable and impressive speeches that he ever made. Taking his stand as usual on the pulpit in his Mosque at Medina he addressed his dovoted followers in strains which it is difficult to excel in pathos: "I may not now live long with you," he said. "I always tried to be fair and impartial and deal equitably with you. I know not if I owe any one of you any debt in the form of money or injury I might have done. If I do I am prepared to pay the debt or the penalty." The companions of the Prophet sat grief-sticken and many of them were weeping when to their utter bewilderment and horror a man from among them stood up and demanded to take his revenge for an injury, which he said, the Prophet had inflicted upon him. The fury and surprise of the Muslims knew no bounds. They could not concieve that a Muslim could make such an insolent demand. But the Prophet stood calm and composed, "What is the injury which I did to you and when and in what manner do you intend to take your vengeance" asked the Holy Prophet. "You slightly bruised my ribs with the point of your spear while straightening the ranks of the Muslims in a certain battle," replied the man. The Holy Prophet (peace and the blessings of God be upon him) uncovered his ribs and asked the man to satisfy himself as he liked. The man advanced towards the Prophet. The agitated conditon of the minds of his companions can better be imagined than described. But they could do nothing since the Prophet had himself offered his body to be bruised and pierced. The man instead of piercing and wounding the body of the Prophet as those assembled in the Mosque thought, kissed it and said, "This is how I wished to take

my revenge from you, O Prophet of God." The Muslims were relieved. Many envied his opportunity and admired him for the way in which he utilized it.

This was, perhaps, the last public act of the Prophet and by it he testified for all times that Islam stands for equality beween man and man. See! a Prophet of God, the Emperor of Arabia, the ruler of the destinies of a whole nation offering his body to be bruised and wounded at the demand of an ordinary and quite inconspicuous individual. He did not demand any proof. He called for no witness. He simply believed in what the man said and prepared himself for any revenge which he might think fit to take. Could nobility of character rise higher? The Prophet lived up to what he taught. He taught his people and through them the whole of mankind that there was no difference, whatever, between man and man as God's creatures and as the members of human society and hence all were entitled to equal rights. And what he taught he so nobly and magnificently acted upon. The whole course of human history fails to produce any man who had lived up to his principles and ideals in the way in which that Son of the Desert, the unlettered Prophet, did. May peace and the blessings of God be upon him!

THE PROPHET'S MARRIAGE WITH ZAINAB

In a previous issue of *the Review of Religions* we had referred to the subject of the marriage of the Holy Prophet (Peace be upon him) with Zainab. We had only very briefly stated the circumstances and conditions under which this marriage took place. That was not the occasion to deal with this important topic at greater length. But even that brief statement of actual facts, we are convinced, was sufficient to dispel any honest doubts and misgivings that might have been entertained by any unprejudiced and impartial person about the motives of the Holy Prophet in contracting this marriage. But as this marriage has been used as an instrument by the Prophet's detractors to misrepresent and malign him and degrade him in the estimation and respect of those who are not in possession of full, genuine and reliable historical facts, we take this opportunity to deal with this subject a little more exhaustively.

On her marriage with the Prophet, Khadija, his first wife, had presented him with a slave, who afterwards became one of the foremost leaders of Islam and a very distinguished and highly respected companion of the Prophet. The Prophet at once emancipated Zaid—this was the name of that slave. Zaid's devotion to the Prophet was so selfless and unbounded that he flatly refused to part company with him (the Prophet) when on a later occasion his father and uncle came to the Prophet and requested to him to let Zaid go with them. The Prophet loved Zaid so much that he came to be known as his son. This attachment towards each other ever remained on the increase till Zaid died and the Prophet soon after followed his beloved companion to the grave.

The Holy Prophet was very anxious to deal a death-blow to the system of slavery that was prevalent in his time. This he could not do in a better manner than to marry a lady of his own

family—one of the most distinguished of all the Qurashite houses—with a slave. He proposed *Z*aid's marriage with *Z*ainab. At first *Z*ainab hesitated. He was always very conscious of the superiorty of her social status, being the member of a highly respected family. *Z*aid was only a freed slave. He was a non-Quraishite, very probably a non-Ishmaelite too. This was quite natural on *Z*ainab's part to demur to accept him as her husband. But this was precisely the aim that the Prophet had in view by proposing to her to agree to her marriage with *Z*aid. He was determined to abolish and level to the ground all false notions of invidious superority based solely upon the considerations of family, caste or birth. The Prophet succeeded in his purpose. *Z*ainab consented. A freed slave became the lord and master of a scion of one of the proudest houses in all Arabia. Slavery was done to death by this noble practical example. But man's deep-rooted ideas do not change in a single day. In spite of her piety and righteousness, her godliness and virtuousness, the idea still lingered in *Z*ainab's mind that socially she was superior to her husband. *Z*aid, too, in spite of the love that the Prophet lavished upon him and the respect and esteem in which he was held by all Muslims suffered from inferiority complex. Evidently such incompatible feelings and notions could not lead to that sweetness and harmony of mutual relations which are the expected and desired results of a happy wedded life. The husband and wife became estranged. Estrangement gradually developed into coldness of relations which in turn gave place to bitterness. *Z*aid requested the Holy Prophet to have the marriage dissolved. How deeply the Prophet's feelings were hurt when he heard of *Z*aid's request can better be imagined than described. He of all persons was responsible for this marriage. He of all persons must have been hurt most when he saw that this marriage was going to be dissolved. In the words of the Qur-ān the Prophet remonstrated with *Z*aid when he heard of his intention and advised him to pull on with his wife. امسک علیک زوجک واتق اللہ "Keep your wife to yourself and fear God," he said to *Z*aid. *Z*aid tried to pull on and *Z*ainab on her part also did what humanly she could do to avoid dissolution of the marriage. You can do anything

in the world but you can not reconcile persons of inherently incompatible temperaments. To attempt to effect this is to combine fire and water which is tantamount to the destruction of both. When the Prophet had realized that Zainab and Zaid could live together no longer they were separated. Of the two Zainab was apparently the more aggrieved party. A divorced woman is generally supposed, though quite wrongly, as disgraced and discredited. Zainab very keenly felt this supposed disgrace. In deference to the wish of the Prophet she had consented to marry a man whom she looked upon socially much inferior to her. And now she was divorced by the same man. This was too much for her. The Holy Prophet realized that he was, to some extent, responsible for the unhappy and miserable condition in which Zainab was placed. He was also instructed by divine revelation to marry Zainab. Zainab had submitted to his wish in marrying Zaid much against her own inclination. Now she was a divorced woman. The Holy Prophet was morally bound, let alone all considerations of divine commandment which he received in this connection, to marry her if she so desired and thus to make amends for her suupposed wrong. Call our Prophet what you may but he quite sincerely and honestly believed in the divine origin of his revelations. The revelation to marry Zainab was there. Imam Zohri has stated this fact corroborated and attested to by Ali, son of Imam Hussain. Zainab herself wished to marry him From the wordly point of view he was morally bound to submit to her wish in return to her submission to his wish. Moreover her marriage with Zaid had served its purpose. This marriage had raised the status of the emancipated slaves to that of the full blooded Qurashites and had demolished all false ideas of assumed superiority. So where was the harm and where the bad motives which are attributed to the Prophet if he married Zainab. Zainab may have been beautiful. But the Prophet had at least as, if not more, beautiful wives as Zainab and younger in years to boot. She was 35 years when the Prophet married her and 35 years in a hot country like Arabia is a fairly advanced age. If she consented to marry the Prophet after she was divorced, she must have more readily agreed to marry him

when he was comparatively younger and when she was prevailed upon much against her wish to marry a freed slave whom as a husband she did not like very much. The Prophet's marriage with Zainab served a double purpose. The idea then very prevalent among the Arabs that position of adopted sons was analogous and equal in every respect to that of real sons was for ever removed and adequate recompense was also made to Zainab for the loss she imagined she had sustained by her divorce. Zainab was an extremely fortunate lady. Her marriage with Zaid served a very noble purpose: it raised the status of the freed slaves and her marriage with the Prophet served an equally noble purpose. After its consummation it was forbidden to adopt sons and to call any one except after the name of his father.

To state that once on seeing Zainab in her house in the absence of Zaid the Prophet became bewitched and captivated by the beauty of her person and cosequently compelled Zaid to divorce her and married her against the wish both of Zaid and Zainab is the height of ignorance of historical facts and a falsehood of the most diabolical and heinous nature. If such had been the case Zaid could not remain the most devoted and loyal companion of the Prophet as he was and Zainab instead of being a faithful and loyal wife would have cursed his memory. But Zaid sealed his unparalleled and unprecedented fidelity and attachment to the Prophet and to his cause with the blood of his life on the battle-field of *Mauta* and Zainab deeply cherished the memory of her beloved and revered husband and master with unabated and unsullied affection till the last breath of her life The fact that Waqdi and Abdullah bin Amir Aslami, according to historians and traditionists, the two most unreliable narrators, are responsible for this false report is enough to prove its complete unreality and baselessness. Ibn Hajr in *Fath-ul-Bari*, Ibn Kasir in his Commentary and Zurqani in *Sharah-i-Mowahib* have even refused to mention this concoction, dubbing it as a disgrace to truth and reality. Men of perverted nature may pounce upon the Prophet's marriage with Zainab as a pretext to insinuate that with advance of his years his lust and lasciviousness also increased. But the fact alone that the Prophet passed

the best years of his life with a wife who was at least fifteen years older than him and that he did not marry any other woman even when his wife had reached the much advanced age of 60 and he himself was hale and hearty constitutes incontestible evidence of the insinuation being devoid of all truth and reality.

It looks really very strange that a man, when he was comparatively much younger in years and more susceptible to carnal passions, did not at all hesitate to scornfully reject and spurn power, prestige, wealth and beautiful women to share his bed, but preferred to select a divorced woman of a fairly advanced age (as Zainab evidently was) for the gratification of his so-called carnal passions, when he had become old and his responsibilities and duties had greatly increased. It is a queer sort of carnality which seeks gratification in marrying widows and divorced women of advanced ages alone. Did there ever live a lascivious person who like the Holy Prophet always married widows and divorced women and led the most laborious, simple, frugal life? Could the Prophet afford to indulge in gaity and light-hearted marry-making in the last years of his life as his detractors try to depict him, when he was surrounded on all sides by enemies, when he had to manage the affairs of a State, had to guide the destinies of a whole nation, had to lead his expeditions in person, had to educate and train his followers in the teaching the diffusion and dissemination of which he considered to be the most sacred and pleasing mission of his life? Certainly not.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

PROPHETS *Vs.* SCIENTISTS

(By Mr. Abdus Sattar)

This subject presupposes existence of God and hence is meant only for those who believe in Him. It may be split up into several questions with a view to easily understand it.

I. What is meant by the terms "Prophets" and "Scientists"?

Prophet is a man appointed as such by divine revelation to advise human beings to love and fear their God alone, and foretells, on the basis of divine revelation his and his followers' progress, and his adversaries' decline.

Scientist is one who systematically studies properties of things and the chain of causal connexion in the universe with a view to making humanity control its surroundings.

By divine revelation in the above definition is meant not merely, as some think, inspiring human heart with a noble thought, but actually speaking to man by God in words.

II. Are Prophets a Reality?

Some people are disposed to think that in fact there is no such thing as Prophets. The so-called Prophets were nothing but men who either were prompted by noble thoughts to effect a moral reformation in their nations or were deceived in themselves through mental derangement, or were a little wiser than ordinary men and deceived others for selfish motives. But this is not true. Prophets are an undeniable reality. The reasons are as under:—

(*i*) God is رب العالمين He supports, nourishes and looks after the progress of everything within its own sphere. When he has created innumerable means to sustain our physical body, a thing of minor importance, how can it be said that He has neglected altogether our spiritual progress or well-being, a thing of major importance, which constitutes the quintessence of life and the very basis of real happiness. For spiritual advancement, it is essential that we should be in possession of sure knowledge as to the line of action by which we can reach this goal. Our life is too short to make experiments with uncertain knowledge in this connection. Reason and conscience alone cannot be depended upon. For

conscience is greatly affected by surroundings in the process of human growth and consequently differs in different men. As to Reason, there is no such independent entity to whom we should go and ask for its guidance. Wise men irreconcilably differ from one another in their judgments. Whom should we follow? Again, Reason alone cannot give us sure knowledge. The best it can do is to feel necessity for the existence of a thing. It says that a certain thing *ought to be*, but whether that *is* it cannot say. Hence it is, that in worldly matters, for sure knowledge it stands in need of various helpers in the shape of experience, experiment, history, evidence of reliable witnesses, etc. How is it then that in spiritual matters we should think that it does not require any assistance? Surely it does. Man of himself is unable to discover with certainty secrets of spiritual world. He stands in need of superhuman or divine assistance. God must speak to him and inform him of the line of action which is conducive to spiritual development. It is only to holy men that He reveals spiritual secrets and through them to others. Thus is established the necessity for Prophets.

(*ii*) Man is naturally thirsting for his beloved Lord. It is inconceivable that the Most Merciful, the Rahman, the Rahim should have left him to perish by trying to find out the way to Him through his weak and fallible reason unassisted by any revelation from Him. Now, revelation presupposes the existence of Prophets.

(*iii*) God must punish the man for evil deeds and reward him for good ones. Mere conscience or reason cannot rightly judge whether a proposed act is good or bad, for a good act is that which pleases Him and a bad act is that which displeases Him. We often make mistakes in judging what will please our friends. Can we feel sure without His letting us know, that a certain action will please or displease Him? When he holds us responsible for our actions, is it not necessary that He should first inform us by means of revelation what is good and what is bad?

(*iv*) Lives of Prophets are in themselves a conclusive proof of their truthfulness; *e. g.*, their extraordinary love for God and humanity, their pious life, their exceptional wisdom and knowledge, necessity for a reformer in their age, their noble object in life,

their excellent practical and practicable teachings, their sincere perseverance in face of crushing opposition and in the circumstances when no manner of hope of worldly gain can be entertained by any person, whether wise or foolish; last of all divine help for them in various ways especially in the shape of fulfilment of prophecies and of progress of their followers and downfall of their enemies.

(*v*) Agreement in the fundamental teachings (*e. g.*, Unity of God, His attributes, details of the hereafter, paradise, hell, angels, attributes of human soul, etc.) of all Prophets, divided from one another by the impassable barriers of space, of time and distance, proves that their source of knowledge was one and the same which is above the limitations of time and space. Had they been mere deceivers, such an agreement among them would have been an impossibility.

(*vi*) The fulfilment of hopes of spiritual progress held out by Prophets to their true followers is another argument of their truthfulness. Their followers become recipients of divine revelation; their prayers are accepted; their hearts are filled with divine love to such an extent that love for all other things sinks into insignificance before it; they begin to eschew sin as if it were a deadly poison; they are helped by God in their difficulties and signs are shown for them in the world; they love their fellow-beings with all their heart, convey to them the message of truth running the risk of their life, and to effect a reformation in the world lay down their very lives. Had Prophets themselves not reached this spiritual stage, how could their followers do, and how could they give a detailed and precise description of each spiritual stage? Can a person who is blind from his birth rightly describe the nature of various colours?

It may appear doubtful to some whether the followers of a Prophet can reach such a high spiritual stage. But, for the Ahmadees, the followers of Ahmad, the Prophet of this age it is a well-established fact, for some of them have reached the stage where God speaks to man; and majority of them have so much spiritually progressed that a complete change is witnessed in their lives, their prayers are accepted and their hearts are full of extraordinary divine love.

III. Can a scientist believe in a Prophet?

Surely. A scientist must believe a fact. A large number of scientists, *e. g.*, chemists, botanists, psychologists, physicians, etc. flourished in Islam.

IV. How is it then that scientists and Prophets appear to be diametrically opposed to each other?

It is wrong to say that scientists always disagree with prophets. A scientist studies Nature or the *work* of God whereas a prophet places before us *words* of God. It is quite clear that there can be no disagreement between divine words and divine works. Consequently, there can be no opposition between the revelations of a prophet and the results of experiments of an infallible scientist. The reason why sometimes there appears to be a disagreement between a prophet and a scientist is that as there is no infallible scientist either a wrong conclusion is arrived at in studying Nature or a wrong interpretation is put upon the revelations of a prophet.

The results of investigations of a scientist may disagree either with the revelations of a prophet or with his words based not on his revelations but on the investigations of the scientists of his time. In the first case the scientist has made a mistake. In the second case, he may be right or wrong for the disagreement really is between him and his predecessors and not between him and the prophet.

It is far from truth to say that scientists and prophets oppose each other. The truth is that they help each other. Prophets say something on the basis of divine revelation; scientists prove the truth thereof by investigation and experimentation. Again a scientist realizes his mistake where his investigation does not agree with the revelations of a prophet. He tries to rectify it and at last arrives at the right conclusion.

V. Who is more useful to humanity, Prophets or scientists?

The test of usefulness of a thing is whether it helps us in achieving a certain object. If one thing helps us more than another we say it is more useful. Where there are two or more objects, the thing that helps us in attaining the higher or highest object is more useful than others.

Now there are two objects: temporary happiness and everlasting happiness. The second is decidedly the higher object. Prophets help us to attain this while scientists the first. Prophets give us peace of mind by establishing an unbreakable connection between us and our Lord; scientists think out means of worldly comfort and try to make us lead a happy life but to a great extent in vain; for real happiness lies in peace of mind.

(*ii*) A single prophet quickens a dead nation whereas a large number of scientists are required to raise their nation to power. How the Israelites and the Arabs were brought to life by the Prophets Moses and Mohammad (may peace and blessings of God be upon them!) is known to all. As to the Prophets who did not see their nation rise in their life, it will suffice to say that it was through their teachings that their followers eventually gained power in the world. Those who rejected them were reduced to utter helplessness and subjection.

(*iii*) Prophets establish justice and peace in the world. They are not products of their age. They go against the whole world and make it follow in their footsteps. Besides, they set for others an example of pious life to follow. Scientists have nothing to do with the ethical or the spiritual sphere. They are mere products of their age.

(*iv*) Prophets give us sure knowledge as their knowledge is based on divine revelations. On the other hand, what scientists say is generally of uncertain value. Their theories are always undergoing a change.

V. What is the difference between a miracle and a wonder of science?

A miracle may be defined as a divine sign shown to the world with a view to establishing nearness to God of a particular individual, and which is, taking into consideration the circumstances of the case, out of human power to show.

A wonder of science, on the other hand, is merely a work of human reason and hence is within the power of man to do.

To give an illustration. It is no miracle if a professor of Mathematics solves very difficult questions. But if a person who

never read a single line of books on Mathematics and has never been in the company of mathematicians rightly answers those questions, it is nothing but a miracle provided he does not use foul means and has not developed his mental faculties so as to be able to read the minds of others. To solve such questions in these circumtances, is beyond human powers and the man who does this must be admitted to have been assisted by some intelligent being other than man *i. e.*, God. This illustration will explain why the serpent of Moses or the earthen birds of Christ are believed to be miracles whereas the wonderful inventions of modern scientists are not looked upon as miracles.

Where a miracle appears similar to a wonder of science the simple way of distinguishing it from the latter is to know the circumstances in which the miracle was shown ; the pious life of the man showing it, and other miracles shown by him which cannot be confused with inventions of scientists. For it is only on rare occasions that miracles of this nature are shown. They generally consist of accepted prayers, uniqueness in purity of language and vastness of spiritual knowledge, and fulfilment of prophecies of one's progress and downfall of one's enemies.

VII. Do prophets stand in the way of their followers' mental progress by depriving them of freedom of thought ?

No, they do not. The fact is that there are three kinds of problems. First those problems, solution whoreof is essential for spiritual progress or for maintenance of peace in the world, but reason alone cannot solve them with certainty, *e. g.*, divine attributes, angels, human soul, life after death, hell, paradise, moral code for men. Prophets answer such problems in detail. Secondly, those which are indirectly connected with spiritual progress, or maintenance of peace in the world, *e. g.*, creation of the universe, creation of the human race from a single couple, prohibition of certain foods, etc., etc. These prophets answer briefly, and details are left for human reason to find out. Thirdly, those which are purely of worldly nature and are unimportant from spiritual view-point, *e. g.*, means of wordly comfort, for instance, means of transportation, water supply, sanitary measures, etc., instruments of fighting, measures for agricultural improvement, means for overcoming the difficulties of space and time etc. etc. Such problems are out of the sphere of prophethood and here scientists

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

are free to make investigations and propound whatever theories they like. From this classification it will be seen that prophets do not come to take away freedom of thought from us but to help our reason with respect to those problems a wrong solution of which means our destruction.

(*ii*) Another argument that followers of a Prophet make progress mentally is that they believe in him after a thorough investigation and careful consideration of his claims as by taking this step they practically court bitter opposition on all hands. Again, they have to think out and equip themselves with strong arguments every day with a view to answer the daily-growing objections of their opponents. In this way, without doubt, they progress mentally far more than others.

(*iii*) History shows that followers of prophets make wonderful mental and worldly progress. Among them appear great scientists and philosophers, and sooner or later they begin to rule over their opponents.

(*iv*) It is wrong to say that prophets discourage our reason. They rather encourage it by praising those who think over the question of creation of the universe and investigate properties of everything and study the chain of causal connection. Are they not scientists ? The Holy Quran praises them in the following verses :—

ان فی خلق السماوات والارض واختلاف اللیل والنهار لایات لاولی الالباب۔ الذین یذکرون الله قیاما وقعودا وعلی جنوبهم ویتفکرون فی خلق السماوات والارض۔ ربنا ما خلقت هذا باطلا۔ سبحانک وقنا عذاب النار۔

"Surely in the creation of the heavens and the earth and the alternation of the night and the day, these are signs for men of understanding; those who remember Allah standing, sitting and lying on their sides and reflect on the creation of the heavens and the earth. Our Lord, Thou hast not created this in vain; glory be to Thee; save us then from the chastisement of fire."

Followers of a Prophet decline only when his teachings are neglected.

VIII. What principles should be observed by a scientist who believes in Prophets ?

(*i*) He should not propound a theory which is clearly against divine revelation for it is surely wrong.

(*ii*) If a revealed book answers a problem briefly, details should be investigated by him. But he must bear in mind that as long as the results of his investigations do not agree with the answer given by the Book his efforts are not successful.

(*iii*) He should know that divine commandments are full of wisdom and therefore he should try to find out the hidden wisdom underlying them if not given in the Book or if given try to verify it to silence the enemies of his faith.

(*iv*) He should always pray to God for guidance and show due respect to all Prophets.

(*v*) He should discard the generally received principle that one should not believe a thing unless it is established with mathematical exactness. For it is in most cases impracticable. If it is always observed in practice, it will lead to inconceivable misery, mischief, and bloodshed in the world. According to it, a man must not believe a child to be his son unless this fact has been proved beyond a shadow of doubt by some means, *e. g.*, by testing the blood of the man and the child. Again a patient must not take a medicine unless he feels quite sure that it will cure him. But Prophets say that our belief should be based on probability and we should not always wait for perfect certainty. Thus if the wife of a man is very pious, the child to which she gives birth is of her husband. This is the right course.

IX. If the wise believe in Prophets, how is it that Ahmadiyyat is spreading not so quickly in this enlightened age of ours as did the earlier religions in dark ages ; why most of the Modern Scientists are atheists ? Will they embrace Islam ?

It is absolutely wrong to say that Ahmadiyyat is with the exception of very few religions progressing slowly as compared with the earlier religions. Compare it for instance with Christianity Jainism, Sikhism, etc. and you will find that it has made a more

rapid progress. Within forty years of its life, it has reached every nook and corner of the world.

The fact is that the chief factors which favour the spread of a religion are the soundness of its principles, nature of the claims of its founder, length of his ministry worldly power, lack of individualism and cares, means of communications etc. Now, our times are so hard that nobody finds time to discuss religious matters. He must toil day and night to support his family. Individualism has spread nearly all over the world, and unlike former times, no person is going to change his religion blindly simply because a great man of his tribe has adopted another religion. Today every individual examines the principles of a new religion himself and follows it only when his reason is satisfied. Thus where formerly we could change the ideas of a hundred men by changing the ideas of one man only, *i. e.*, their chief, now we are required to change the ideas of every one of them and in this way we have to increase our efforts hundred times. Again our community is a poor one. We possess no power, and I doubt if there is any really wealthy man among us. In these circumstances our progress is miraculous.

As to the irreligiousness of most of the modern scientists, it must be remembered that they were born in western countries where Christianity was the only religion. Islam was presented to them in a very ugly form by Christian ministers for reasons best known to them. No true representative of Islam was there to explain the beauties of his faith and to counteract the evil influences. They were too far from Muslim countries and too ignorant of Arabic to study Islam themselves. Hence, Islam in its misrepresented form they could not accept. The fundamental principles of Christianity *e. g.*, Trinity Godhead of Christ, Atonement etc., appeared to them quite unreasonable. True God they did not know. The necessary consequence was irreligiousness denial of God, or atheism.

But they are not to remain atheist for a long time. Ahmadi preachers have reached western countries and they are spreading light there. When the scientists will listen to them and come to know what Islam is and what are the true attributes of God they will believe in Him and embrace Islam one by one. But when this will happen we cannot say. It depends upon the scientists

themselves. When they will care to listen to our lecturers, that will be the time. But whether it comes in the near future or the remote one, come it must. For this is the glad news given to us by the Promised Messiah (may peace and blessings of God be upon him) in the following words:

(۱) آسمان پر دعوت حق کیلئے اک جوش ہے۔
ہو رہا ہے نیک طبعوں پر فرشتوں کا اُتار۔
(۲) آرہا ہے اس طرف احرار یورپ کا مزاج
نبض پھر چلنے لگی مردوں کی ناگہ زندہ وار
(۳) کہتے ہیں تثلیث کو اب اہل دانش الوداع
پھر ہوئے ہیں چشمۂ توحید پر از جان نثار

(1) There is a great excitement in the heavens for the spread of truth; angels are now influencing the good-natured.

(2) The free thinkers of Europe are gradually inclining to it; the pulse of the dead has all of a sudden begun to beat like that of the living.

(3) The wise and the learned are discarding the doctrine of Trinity, and have again come to the fountain of Unity with all their heart and all their soul.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Get back to your kitchens

Europe seems to have become sick of women's so-called emancipation. They are being increasingly advised to quit the "careers" for the members of the stronger sex and get back to their hearths and kitchens which is their proper place. Signor Mussolini was the first leader of note who raised his voice against the way in which western women are behaving now-a-days. Herr Hitler, Germany's Man of Destiny, has now decreed that women employed in the State services should be made to resign their posts and make room for men. The view that woman's proper place is her home is shared alike by persons of note among both the sexes in the West. Ursula Bloom is an English woman of many parts. She is a very distinguished writer. In a recent issue of *Answers* (London) she has written a long article on woman's duty in life in the course of which she says :—

> I want women to be happy.
>
> I want women to be free. I want women to find their own level again.
>
> But they have got to learn a lot of things that they have either forgotten or have refused to admit.
>
> Women have got to learn that they are women.
>
> They were never intended to take over breadwinning jobs, and to run the world, yet that is exactly what they have been trying to do, ever since 1914, when they saw the opportunity, and, seizing it, have hung on like mad.
>
> Women have got to learn that, if they insist on taking over men's jobs, and leaving them unemployed and on the dole, there can be no marriage. There has got to be a living wage to marry. There has got to be money to find the rent for two and the food for two, and the dress and all the rest of it for two.
>
> What is more, women have got to learn that the wherewithal must come from the man's side of the house.

Woman must learn that her place is the home. Her role is domesticity, her duty in life is wifehood and motherhood.

Women have got to learn that the truly womanly woman gets more out of life than all the mannish, paddle-your-own-canoe females going. Woman was made for love, and love carries you a dickens of a way.

Women have got to learn that flannel trousers may be amusing, shorts may be attractive for the time being, an Eton crop engaging, but when you boil things down there is nothing so attractive as a filmy evening frock, and hair that is curled, and the knowledge that "he" is looking at you twice. On such an occasion Miss 1933 goes all moss-rosebuddy again. She can't help it.

Women have got to learn that there is nothing to be ashamed of in the domestic job. We have made a grim mistake in the past in jeering at it. It is not dull! It is not degrading!

I don't care what anybody says to the contrary. I am still convinced that home is the happiest place in all the world. I am still sure that being somebody's wife and somebody's mother is the most satisfying and happiest job going. I don't know of any fellow-worker who would not throw her present job to the winds if she were offered the job of being Mrs. Lovebird and having a nest and lots of little lovebirds of her own.

Hindus and the Communal Award

The failure of the Hindu and Muslim leaders to arrive at a settlement regarding the communal question compelled the British Government to decide it in a manner that seemed to it just and equitable. That decision came to be known as the Premier's or Communal Award. No soon were the terms of the said Award came to be known, it was fiercely denounced by the entire Hindu Press. But before its announcement the Prime Minister had warned the leaders of all Indian communities that once the Government arrived at a decision any alteration or modification of it without the mutual consent of the concerned parties would bequite out of the question. The Award was modified by the Poona Pact as far as the Hindus were concerned. The Hindus of Bengal have now raised a great hue and cry against both the original Award, and its modified form, the Poona Pact. The Bengalee Hindu leaders have cajoled and threatened

in turn the British Government with the worsening of the relations between the Government and the Congress and even with the recrudescence of terrorism in a more virulent form if the communal Award and the Poona Pact were not changed agreeably to the wishes of the Bengalee Hindu Nationalists. To this threat the *Statesman* has given a crushing reply. In the course of its leading article entited *Lord Zetland and Bengal*, of September 28, the paper says :—

> In a spirit of honest inquiry we would ask our contemporary (*Amrit Bazar Patirka*) some simple questions. The first is in what way the relations between Great Britain and the Congress, which stands for the disruption of the Empire and for the revival of civil disobedience, non-co-operation and every kind of subversive movement on the first available opportunity, can become worse ? If Great Britain and the Congress are not enemies, what is the meaning of the word ? Granted that the Congress Hindus threaten Great Britain and the Moslems with terrorism if the Award is not revised, what precisely do they offer if it is revised ? When Lord Irwin came to terms with the Congress in 1931, was or was there not an increase in the public preaching of the necessity for murder, for "thousands of Bhagat Singhs," for "Sikhs to come into the firing line" ? Was or was there not an orgy of special editions and leading articles and resolutions glorifying murderers as heroes ? Was or was there not a great increase in the actual volume of terrorist crime ? Lord Zetland, who was not then in India, may also be invited to study these statistics. Further, we would ask our Congress contemporaries to tell us frankly how we are to reconcile their continual assertion that the White Paper is a sham, that they have no interest in the reforms, that the Moderates are dupes and fools and that the only practical policy is to threaten the British and to injure the British, with this demand for seats in the legislature ? We must know first of all whether we are living in a world where words have some meaning.

What is wrong with Christian Missions in Africa ?

Christian missions have done all that could possibly be done to Christianize the Dark Continent. Tons of gold have been spent and armies of missionaries have worked for years to win it for Jesus Christ. But it has unequivocally been admitted by those Christian missionaries who have worked in Africa that the results as compared with the stupendous sacrifices made

in the form of money and endeavour have been quite disappointing. In a very long article in its October number the *National Review* (London) reviews the causes of this disheartening failure. The article is of special interest and significance for the Ahmadi missionaries, especially for those who are working or are expected to work in foreign countries. For their benefit we reproduce that part of the article in which the journal lays bare the mistakes that almost all workers in foreign countries are liable to commit. It says:

> Perhaps the greatest adversary of the missionary is—the missionary. It sounds paradoxical, but nevetheless it is true. As a witty Frenchman once remarked, "you English have a hundred religions but only one sauce." Each sect endeavours to gain converts to its particular interpretation of Christianity, and each claims to reveal the one true doctrine. The Bantu is a shrewed reasoner. Logically he argues to himself that if the white men themselves cannot agree on the subject cf their own religion, he cannot be expected to judge which is the best. The Bantu's own simple doctrine of the Great Spirit of the world, and the lesser spirits of forest, mountain and stream is accepted by all his tribe without question or cavil. Even in the event of the earnest seeker after knowledge deciding upon the particular Church and asking for instruction, he finds that the white man has not one gospel but four versions, each slightly different, not counting an Old Testament full of blood and ferocity. Is not his argument natural when he contends that the white man has no real religion.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

Again it says :

> At the other end of the scale and the type that, for want of a better name, might be described in the Americanism of a "go-getter", full of enthusiasm and self-confidence he comes out to Africa, utterly ignorant of the native language and of the native psychology. Immediately he "gets busy." He holds meetings at which he speaks in a language so badly learned that his hearers can scarce make head or tail of his discourse ; but they understand the store that he has opened for the sale of goods *to convert only* at half the price for which similar commodities can be bought elsewhere. Within a year he proudly claims in his letters home that he has made sundry scores or hundreds of converts to Christianity. It would be ludicrous were it not so pitiful. Christ himself only laid claim to a dozen—no, eleven ; for Judas must be deleted—whole-hearted disciples in whom he could trust. The converted

followers of that great man Livingstone were few, for he rightly refused to bring the ceremony of baptism into disrepute and mockery. He exercised months and years of patient teaching and example before he was convinced that the neophyte really believed from his heart in the Christian religion.

It adds :—

Lastly, there is the type that perhaps does the most harm, the one that can be described as " The Destroyer." With a heavy hand he sweeps away everything connected with the simple faith in the Great Spirit that broods over the African's welfare, and custom to which the native subscribes. The native loses faith in his own tribal deity and in exchage he receives—nothing. Was it not Sidney Smith who said "Brother Ringeltaub claims to have made a Christian though all he has accomplished is to destroy a Hindu ?" Real converson is a slow process, it cannot be accomplished in a day or a year. The native is left like a drowning man with nothing to cling to ; swiftly he sinks into the atheistic and criminal class of detribalized native who fears and respects nothing but the chance of being caught by the Police. They are an increasing class, these victims of misdirected enthusiasm, and they form a stratum of African society, with which many governments will have seriously to reckon. Disillusioned and without any form of faith in which they can truly believe, these people are a class ready to receive enthusiastically all machinations of the paid agitator and the Bolshevist.

NOTES ON THE HOLY QURAN

There is no unanimity of opinion as to the exact number of the Quranic verses supposed to have been cancelled. It varies from 5 to 500 with different writers. This want of agreement as regards the number of abrogated verses is sufficient to convince the observing mind that the cancellation theory is no more than a mere guess-work.

The true meaning of the verse, as has been pointed out above, is that a portion of the previous law has been replaced by a better one in the Holy Qur-ān, and certain commandments which were lost, have been conserved in the same book. It may be noted in passing that the verse under discussion is clear on the point that, according to the Holy Qur ān, the previous scriptures *have been* corrupted.

The Jews were angry because a book was sent to the Muslims. They are here told that they have no cause to be angry, for this book is superior to the previous scriptures.

الم تعلم ان الله له ملک السماوات والارض۔ ومالکم من دون الله من ولی ولا نصیر۔

108. A-lam ta'lam ann allāha la-hū mulkus-samāwātī wal-ard ? Wa mā la-kum-min dūnil-lāhi min walīyin-walā nasir.

108. Knowest thou not that the kingdom of the heavens and the earth is for Allah alone ? And for you there is neither any guardian nor any helper beside Allah.

103. In this verse, the Jews are told that it will be to their own interests to embrace Islam, for otherwise, it is said, they will have neither friend nor helper against Allah.

There is a delicate implication in the verse which should not be missed, *viz*, that the Muslims, though despised and persecuted to-day, will receive not only the

spiritual favours from God, but will be masters of large earthly kingdoms as well.

ام تریدون ان تسئلو رسولکم کما سئل موسی من قبل ومن یتبدل الکفر بالایمان فقد ضل سواء السبیل۔

109. Am turī-dūna an tas'alū rasūla-kum kamā su'ila Mūsā min qabl; wa man-yatabad-da-lil-kufra bil-īmāni, fa-qad dalla sawa as-sabīl.

109. Do you wish to ask of your prophet as of Moses they asked before this ? And whoso exchanges belief for disbelief has undoubtedly gone astray from the straight path.

ود کثیر من اهل الکتاب لو یردونکم من بعد ایمانکم کفاراً حسدا من عند انفسهم من بعد ما تبین لهم الحق فاعفوا واصفحوا حتی یاتی الله بامره۔ ان الله علی کل شیء قدیر۔

110. Wadda kathīrum-min ahlil-kitābi, lau yaruddūna-kum-mim-ba'di īmāni-kum kuffāran, hasadam-min'indi anfusi-kum-mim-ba'di mā tabaiyyana la-hu-mulhaqq; fa'fū wasfāhū, hattā ya'tiy allāhu bi-amrih ; inn-allaha 'ala kulli shai'in qadir.

110. Many of the people of the Book desire to turn you again into disbelievers after you have believed out of envy from themselves after the truth has dawned upon them ; but forgive them and turn away from them till Allah sends down His decree. Surely Allah has power over all things.

104. This verse mentions the third artifice which the Jews employed to overthrow the mission of the Holy Prophet (may peace and blessings of God be upon him !). They asked the Holy Prophet such absurd and silly questions as had no bearing on religion. This they did to inoculate the Muslims with the same spirit of stupid questioning, so that their hearts might gradually become estranged from the dignity of faith and give way to doubt. In warning the Muslims against such a course, the Holy Qur-ān points out that these people had ruined themselves

by putting similar questions to Moses and that the Muslims should not, therefore, follow their evil example.

By manifold devices, some of which have been referred to above, the Jews wished to lead the Muslims astray, and their designs had their basis in jealousy ; but the Muslims are exhorted not to quarrel with them for this undesirable conduct of theirs, but to wait patiently in a spirit of forbearance till God Himself manifests some way for decision.

There is a subtle distinction between the meanings of عفو *'afw* (forgive) and صفح *safh* (turn away). Whereas the former means *abstaining from punishment*, the latter signifies *turning one's face away*. By using the words together, God exhorts the Muslims not only to refrain from punishing the Jews for their open hostilities and covert machinations, but even from according to them a harsh treatment, and bids them to remain aloof from them.

It is wrong to think that the words "till Allah brings forth His decree," refer to war. It is God's general decree that is meant here, as may be inferred from the words that follow, *viz.*, 'surely, Allah is able to do all things.' Some of the Jews embraced Islam, and the rest perished as a result of divine punishment.

As to the questions put to Moses by the Israelites, the Holy Qur-ān refers to one in Chapter IV, 154 :—

" The People of the Book ask thee to bring down to them a book from heaven. *Wonder not at this*, for they had asked of Moses a greater thing than this; they had said, 'Show us Allah openly.'" This verse gives us an indication as to the nature of the questions that were put to Moses, and it was such questions as these which the Muslims were forbidden to put to their Prophet.

The phrase ' out of envy from themselves ' means that the Holy Prophet (may peace and blessings of God be upon him !) had done nothing to excite their jealousy, but that it was their own evil nature that had given rise to it.

واقيموا الصلوٰة واتوا الزكوٰة۔ وما تقدموا لانفسكم من خير تجدوه عند الله ان الله
Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah
بما تعلمون بصير۔

111. Wa aqīmus-salāta wa ātuz-zakah ; wa mā tuqaddimū li-anfusi-kum-min khairin tajidūhu 'ind allah ; in allāha bi mā ta'malūna basīr.

111. And observe prayer and pay the poor-rate ; and whatever good you send before hand for yourselves, you shall find it with Allah ; surely, Allah sees what you do.

105. When one is subjected to continued persecution, it is only human nature to lose patience. But the Muslims were enjoined to meekly endure trouble and torments, and in order to be able to do so, they were ordered to resort to divine worship on the one hand, and humanity to mankind on the other. By so doing, they would acquire from God the power to endure.

وقالوا لن يدخل الجنة الا من كان هودا او نصارى تلك امانيهم قل هاتوا برهانكم
ان كنتم صدقين۔

112. Waqālū lan-yadkhulal-jannata illā man kāna Hūdan au Naṣārā ; tilka amāniyyu-hum ; qul, hātū burhāna-kum, in kuntum sādiqīn.

112. And they said : None shall ever enter heaven except those who are Jews or Christians ; such are their vain desires. Say ; Bring your proof, if you speak the truth.

106. So far the Christian faith was not separately addressed. But now the Holy Qur-ān mentions them along with the Jews, indicating that their case was no better than that of the latter, both being under the delusion that one could obtain salvation merely by becoming a Jew or a Christian. They forgot the fact that when God had established a fresh covenant, salvation could not be possible without conforming thereto. If, however, the Jews and the Christians were justified in their claims, they should advance some reasons or scriptural evidence

to demonstrate that it was enough for the purposes of salvation to join their folds (and they could not do it, because in their scriptures there was foretold the appearance of a Prophet whom it was enjoined upon them to accept and whose rejection was stated to lead to estrangement from God).

Christianity, as well as Judaism, was meant for the guidance of the Israelites alone. The mission of Jesus was not meant for the whole world (*vide* Matt. VII, 6; X, 6; XV, 24; Mark. VII, 27). Though later on the followers of Christ violated the limit imposed upon Christ's mission and claimed universality for it, yet Christ was sent only for the Israelites, and the foremost object of his life was to uplift that people. As other nations of the world are also the creation of God, it is therefore only right to believe that God must have made some arrangement for their guidance as well. Hence, it is quite unreasonable on the part of the Jews and Christians to hold that the door of salvation was closed against the followers of other faiths; such a view would mean that God had confined salvation to certain tribes, to the entire exclusion of other nations, which is evidently absurd.

Islam is not exposed to the same objection. In the *first* place, it is not a tribal faith, but it is universal in character. In the Holy Quran, it is said about the Holy Prophet (on whom be peace and blessings of God!): "Say, O men, truly, I am the Messenger of Allah to you all—the Messenger of Him to whom belongs the kingdom of the heavens and the earth (VII, 159). *Secondly*, unlike Judaism and Christianity, Islam does not hold hell to be everlasting. As for paradise it teaches that its bounties are never-ending, but Hell it regards as a place of reformation, where the sinners will be purged of their sins to enable them to find their way ultimately to heaven and enjoy the reward of the good deeds they did in this world.

بلیٰ من اسلم وجهه لله وهو محسن فله اجره عند ربه ولا خوف عليهم ولاهم يحزنون۔

113. Balā, man aslama wajha-hū lillāhi, wa huwa muḥsinun, fa-la-hū ajruhū, inda Rabbi-hī; wa lā khaufun, alaihim, wa lā hum yaḥzanūn.

113. Yea; whoso surrenders himself to Allah and is the doer of good deeds, his reward is with his Lord; and no fear shall come upon them, neither shall they grieve.

107. In refutation of the claims of the Jews and the Christians to the monopoly of salvation, the Holy Qur-ān mentions the fundamental principle, that for salvation it is not of any avail to be a Christian or a Jew, but that salvation is the ultimate outcome of absolute surrender to God's will and unqualified compliance with His law. He who does this secures salvation; mere profession of a faith is not enough.

The word محسن *Muḥsin* (the doer of good deeds) has been explained by the Holy Prophet (may peace and blessings of God be upon him!) as follows :—

ان تعبدالله كانك تراه فان لم تكن تراه فانه يراك۔

i.e, you may become a *muhsin*, if "you pray to God in such a spirit of reality and certitude that you feel you are seeing God, or failing that, with the lower degree of conviction that, at any rate, He is seening you." *Muhsin* also means one who does good to God's creatures. Thus, according to Islam, salvation lies in absolute resignation to the will of God and in doing good to God's creation.

RUKU 14

وقالت اليهود ليست النصارىٰ على شيئ وقالت النصارىٰ ليست اليهود على شيئ وهم يتلون الكتاب كذلك قال الذين لا يعلمون مثل قولهم فالله يحكم بينهم يوم القيامة فيما كانوا فيه يختلفون۔

114. Wa qālatil-yahūdu, laisatin-naṣārā 'alā shai'in; wa qālatin-naṣāra, laisatil-yahūdu' alā shai'in, wa hum yatlūnal-kitāb; kadhālika qālal ladhīna lā ya'lamūna mithla

qauli-him; fallāhu yaḥkumu baina hum yaumal-qiyāmati fī-mākānū fī hi yakhtalifūn.

114. And the Jews say: 'The Christians stand on nothing' and Christians say: 'The Jews stand on nothing,' while they both read the Book; likewise say those who have no knowledge according to their saying. But Allah shall judge between them on the day of Resurrection concerning that wherein they disagree.

108. This verse makes mention of another failing of the Jews and the Christians. They were so much given over to prejudice and perverseness that they spoke about each other's faith as wholly worthless and absolutely good-for-nothing. When both read the Bible, they must have had a good deal in common. So the wholesale denial of good by each to the other is inexplicable. The verse adds that this is the case not only with the Jews and the Christians, but the adherents of every other faith who 'lack true knowledge' are also guilty of wholesale denunciation of the other faiths of the world.

Even a cursory study of the Holy Qur-ān leaves no room for doubt that Islam is ever ready to acknowledge truth wherever found and recognize virtue, wherever and to whatever extent it happens to exist. On careful scrutiny, it will be found that all the different faiths possess certain truths, and the true religion is so called not because others are totally devoid of excellences, but because it possesses virtues in a greater degree than others and is free from defects. Islam, while claiming to be full of truth and perfection, acknowledges certain virtues in all existing faiths of the world, and even counsels other faiths of the world to desist from the wholesale denunciation of their rival creeds and to acknowledge the virtues of their rival faiths. It is obvious that if the principle herein enunciated by the Holy Qur-ān be acted upon, a reign of peace will at once set in, because all religious strife originates in misunderstanding.

ومن اظلم ممن منع مساجداللہ ان یذکر فیھا اسمہ وسعی فی خرابھا اولئک ماکان لھم ان یدخلوھا الا خائفین۔ لھم فی الدنیا خزی ولھم فی الاخرۃ عذاب عظیم۔

115. Wa man azlamu mim-mam-mana'a masāji-dallāhi an-yudhkara fi-hasmu-hŭ wa sa'ā fī kharābihā; ulā'ika mā kāna la-hum an yadkhulu-hā illa khā 'if īn; la-hum fid-dunyā kihzyun, wa la-hum fil-ākhirate adhabun azim.

115. And who is more unjust than he who prohibits the name of Allah being glorified in Allah's temples and seeks to ruin them? It was not meet for such men to enter therein save with fear. For them is disgrace in the world; and for them is a great punishment in the next.

109. Continuing, the verse says that so far has the mutual animosity between the Jews and the Christians gone that they do not like to see each other at worship, and, whenever possible, prevent each other from worshipping God and do not allow each other to enter their sanctuaries for worship, although one must be very circumspect about matters relating to the places of worship, it being by no means allowable to prevent men from worshipping the Divine being.

This verse is a forcible indictment of the outrages which the followers of different faiths perpetrate, out of malice, against their opponents' modes and places of worship. They hinder people from worshipping God in their sacred places and even go so far as to destroy their temples. Such acts of violence are denounced here in strong terms and a lesson of charity and tolerance is inculcated.

According to the Holy Qur-ān, all men enjoy the free right to use their own temples, and if some body wishes to worship God in his own way in a place of worship not belonging to his faith, he need not be prevented therefrom, because a temple is a place dedicated to the worship of God and one should act God-fearingly therein. One

who prevents men from worshipping God in places of worship helps to make them scenes of desolation.

This is what the Holy Qur-ān teaches about respect and regard for the worship of other faiths. It is impossible to find in other faiths a parallel to these teachings, which are not only agreeable to reason and common sense but catholic in spirit and conducive to public peace. But the pity is that, in the face of such wholesome teachings, Islam is being denounced as a religion of fanaticism. We can declare, without the least fear of contradiction, that Islam has beaten all existing faiths of the world in promulgation of the spirit of broad-mindedness and regard for truth.

The first person who carried this golden principle into practice was the Holy Founder of Islam (may peace and blessings of God be upon him!) who allowed the Christians of Najran to hold their service in the Muslim Mosque.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

وللہ المشرق والمغرب فاینما تولوا فثم وجہ اللہ ان اللہ واسع علیم۔

116. Wa lillāhil-mashriqu wal maghribu, fa ainamā tuwallū fa-thamma wajhullāh; innallāha wāsi'un' alīm.

116. And Allah's is the East and the West so whithersoever you turn, there shall be Allah's attention. Surely Allah is All-bountiful, Knowing.

110. In this verse it is prophesied that as Muslims followed the right path and preached the unity of God to mankind, therefore that whichever side they would turn their faces, God's succour would back them up, and they would get the upper hand, although they were at the time oppressed and down-trodden and were then prevented from entering the *Ka'ba*. The words 'and Allah's is the East and the West' imply that Islam would spread both in the East and the West. As Islam was to spread first in the East, and then in the West (after the advent of the Promised Messiah), therefore in the verse under comment the word 'East' has been put before the 'West'.

وقالوا اتخذ الله ولداً سبحانه بل له ما فی السماوات وما فی الارض کل له قانتون۔
بدیع السماوات والارض واذا قضی امراً فانما یقول له کن فیکون۔

117. Wa qālut-takha-dh Allāhu waladan; subhanah bal, lahū ma fis samāwāti wal-ard; kullullahū qānitūn.

118. Badi'us-samāwātī wal-ard; wa iḍha qadā amran, fa-inna-mā yaqūlu la-hū, kun, fa-yakūn

117. And they say: 'Allah has taken to himself a son, Holy is He. 'Nay, everything in the heavens and the earth is for Him. To Him are all obedient.

118 The Originator of the heavens and the earth; and when He decrees a thing He does only say in regard to it, "Come into existence," and it comes into existence."

111. As no distinctive defect of the Christian faith had yet been pointed out and they could advance a claim to the promises of God made to the Israelites, so a grievous error of their faith has been pointed out. They ascribe a son to God. Thus the case of the Christians is made clear. They are guilty of setting up equals to God and have, therefore, forfeited their title to the promise given to the Israelites.

Failing to attract converts from among the Jews, the followers of Christ turned their attention to the Romans and the Greeks. They began to adore their own faith in the views prevalent among those people and took to representing Christ as the son of God and began to preach Trinity. The Jewish idiom 'son of God' used for Christ in the New Testament was employed as a convenient instrument for furthering this scheme. It was formed a basis for the God-head of Jesus. But this was quite unjustifiable, because this idiom was used by the Jews in the sense of 'a beloved servant of God' or 'a prophet' and it has been used at many places in the Bible for other men as well. (*Vide* Luke XX, 36; Matth. V, 9, 45 and 49; Deut. XIV, 1; Ex. IV, 22; Galat. III, 26; Wisdom of Solomon II, 18). So it was only to win the sympathy of

powerful European nations that an erroneous significance was put upon the term ' Son of God '. The Holy Qur-ān explodes the theory in the strongest possible terms, and advances many arguments at various places. This verse also deals with this subject and has adduced a number of arguments to show the erroneousness of this dogma.

The first argument is contained in the clause سبحانه *subhāna-hū* ' Holy is He ' *i.e.* He is free from all defects ; and to ascribe a son to Him is to admit certain defects in Him, because if the term ' son ' be used in its literal significance, it denotes one from the seed of another. So, if the word be applied to God in its literal sense, then the following three defects will have to be admitted in Him : *First*, presence of sexual passions ; *secondly*, need for a wife ; *thirdly*, divisibility, because the son is a part of the father's body. Again, if the word has not been used in its literal meaning, Christ can not be considered as a partner in the God-head, because real sonship alone can entitle him to God-head.

Moreover the belief in the Sonship of Christ gives rise to the theory that God is perishable, for the propagation of species is the characteristic of perishable things. Those things which exist as long as there is need for them are free from propagation and procreation. As for instance, man dies and leaves his off-spring. Trees are subject to decay and propagate their kind. Animals are subject to death, and are, therefore, equally subject to the law of procreation. On the other hand, earth and other heavenly bodies are immune from death as long as they supply a need in the cosmos, hence propagation and procreation are not among their characteristics. The possession of a son, in the real sense of the word, thus involves the idea of death in God.

The second argument, as set forth in this verse against the theory of Sonship, is that God does not stand in need of a son, because all things belong to Him. Everything is

His and so He does not stand in need of a son who would strengthen His hands.

The third argument against this notion is that man needs a son to help him in the management and control of his estate. For this purpose also, God does not stand in need of a son for everything that exists renders Him perfect obedience.

The fourth argument advanced against the theory of Sonship is that God is the originator of heavens and earth and so He did not need any helper even in the beginning of creation. Hence the idea that He created Christ so that the latter might create the world is simply absurd.

The fifth argument against this theory as advanced in this verse is that God's powers are boundless and hence He needs no helper. He is self-sufficient.

The word بديع *badī'* (originator) means the creator of something which did not exist before. The word shows that Islam does not regard matter and soul as eternal and imperishable, but believes them to be created and therefore perishable.

It may also be noted that like the Christians, the Jews also ascribed a Son to God (*vide* IX, 30), therefore the verse refers to the Jews as well as the Christians, and arguments advanced therein apply to both.

وقال الذين لا يعلمون لولا يكلمنا الله او تاتينا آية۔ كذالك قال الذين من قبلهم مثل قولهم۔ تشابهت قلوبهم۔ قد بينا الايت لقوم يوقنون۔

119. Wa qālalladḥina lā ya lamūna, lau-lā yukallimu-n Allāhu, au tā tina āyah ; kadḥālika qālal-ladḥina min qablihim, mitḥla qauli him ; tashābahat qulūbu-hum ; qad baiyannal-āyāti liqaumin-yūqinūn.

119 And those who know not say, 'Why does not Allah speak to us, or a sign come to us.' Likewise said those before them according to their saying ; alike are

their hearts. Surely we have made the signs plain for the people who firmly believe.

112. In this verse two demands made by the Jews and the Christians are stated.

The *first* was that the Holy Prophet (may peace and blessings of God be upon him !) should make God speak to all of them and tell them that he was a true prophet. But never, in the time of any of the previous prophets, God spoke to each and every person. So, the Holy Qur-ān points out in this verse that ignorant people, unacquainted with the ways of God, make a demand for direct revelation from God, although this is the same demand as was made from previous prophets also in whom they believe, but they did not comply with it. It was, therefore, unreasonable on their part to make the same demand from the Holy Prophet (on whom be peace and blessings of God !). In fact, their hearts had become like those of the rejectors of the previous prophets, that was why similar demands occurred to them.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

Secondly, they asked for a sign. In reply to this, God says that signs sufficient for the guidance of the right-minded have already been shown and they can profit by them, but there is no remedy for those who are obstinate and perverse.

The demand for a sign made of the Holy Prophet by his opponents does not show that no signs had been shown by him. If such a demand be considered as proof of the absence of signs, it will be impossible to prove that any of the prophets showed any sign. Take, for instance, Christ. Throughout his lifetime, the unbelievers continued to clamour for signs. In Matt. XII, 38 and 39, we read that the Scribes and Pharisees demanded a sign from Christ, but this demand of theirs can not be made the ground work for drawing the inference that Christ showed no signs. We must take the claimant at his own word, and not at the

word of his antagonists. That the Holy Prophet (on whom be peace and blessings of God!) did claim to have shown signs is borne out by the words of the Holy Qur-ān (*vide* note 101, verse 100).

When the unbelievers are represented as demanding an *āyat* (sign), the word always means either a sign in the form of punishment or a sign of their own devising (*vide* XXI, 6-7 ; VI, 38-51 ; XIII, 28-33 ; XX, 134-135).

إنا إرسلناك بالحق بشيرا ونذيراً ولا تسئل عن اصحاب الجحيم-

120 Inna arsalnā-ka, bil-haqqi, bashiran-wa-naḍhiran, wa lā tus 'alu' an ashābil-jahīm.

120. We have sent thee with Truth, a bearer of glad tidings and a warner ; and thou shalt not be called to account for the inmates of hell.

113. As to the unbelievers' demand for punishment, the Holy Qur-ān says that punishment is bound to visit those who refuse to believe in the Holy Prophet (on whom be peace and blessings of God!), because like all other prophets he was the bearer of glad tidings for the believers, and a warner for his opponents. So the latter were sure to be visited by the wrath of God. In fulfilment of this prophecy, all the world witnessed the ruin of the Holy Prophet's adversaries, although worldly conditions and circumstances were in their favour and against the Holy Prophet.

ولن ترضى عنك اليهود ولا النصارى حتى تتبع ملتهم- قل ان هدى الله هو الهدى
ولئن اتبعت اهواءهم بعد الذى جاءك من العلم مالك من الله من ولى ولا نصير-

121. Wa lan tardā 'an-kal-Yahūdu, wa lan-Nasārā, hatta tattabi'a millata hum ; qul, inna huda allāhi huwal-hudā ; wa la-init-taba'ta ahwā'a,hum ba'dal-laḍhi jāa-ka minal-'ilmi, mā-laka mi-nallāhi min-waliyyin-wa lā nasīr.

121. And the Jews will by no means be pleased with thee, nor the Christians, until thou follow their creed.

Say, 'Surely Allah's guidance alone is the guidance. And surely, if thou follow their evil desires after the knowledge that has come to thee, there shall be for thee neither friend nor helper from Allah.

114. The real cause of the opposition of the Jews and the Christians to the Holy Prophet, the verse points out, was no other than that his teachings were not in harmony with their desires, but having been guided by God, it was impossible for the Holy Prophet (on whom be peace and blessings of God!) to accommodate his teachings to their wishes.

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

The words 'If thou follow their desires' are really addressed, not to the Holy Prophet but to the reader, the Muslim. The Holy Prophet has been described in the Holy Qurān as the ideal of manhood (*vide* III, 31, XXXIII, 22), and therefore he was infinitely above the possibility of following the wishes of Jews and Christians in the guidance he had directly received from God. There are in the Holy Qurān many verses which prove that some times, in giving an injunction the Holy Qurān addresses the Holy Prophet when it is decidedly meant for his followers (*vide*, for instance, XVII, 24). Nor is this mode of speech peculiar to the Holy Qurān. In the Bible we come across similar instances. (*Vide* Deut. XVIII, 21, 22).

الذين اتيناهم الكتاب يتلونه حق تلاوته اولئك يومنون به ومن يكفر به فاولئك هم الخاسرون۔

122. Alladḥīna ātainā-humul-kitāba, yatlūna-hū haqqa tilāwa'ih ; ulā'ika yu'minūna bih ; wa man-yakfur bihi, fa-ulā'ika humul-kḥāsirūn.

122. They to whom We have given the Book follow it as it ought to be followed. It is these that believe therein. And whoso believes not therein, it is they who shall be the losers.

115. The verse adds that it was impossible that the class of sincere men who followed the Holy Qurān should

stoop so low as to follow the vain fancies of the Jews and Christians. The Muslims, on the other hand, were the true followers of the Holy Qurān and it was they who were the true believers. The words ' They to whom We have given the Book ' refer to the Muslims and not the Jews and Christians, as the context clearly shows (*vide* Ibn-i-Kaṭḥīr, *p.* 282, Vol. I).

يتلونه *Yatlūna* here means ' follow.' This verb has been used in the same sense in XCI, 3. Many eminent authorities support this interpretation.

The Ahmadiyya Movement

THE Ahmadiyya Movement was founded by Hazrat Ahmad, the Promised Messiah and Mehdi and the expected Messenger of all nations. In the spirit and power of all the earlier prophets he came to serve and reinterpret the final and eternal teachings laid down by God in the Holy Quran. The Movement therefore represents the true and real Islam and seeks to uplift humanity and establish peace throughout the world. Hazrat Ahmad died in 1908, and the present Head of the Movement is his second successor, Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, under whose direction the Movement has established Missions in many parts of the world, the following being the addresses of some of them:—

(1) THE LONDON MOSQUE, 63, Melrose Road,
Southfields, London, S. W. 18, England.

(2) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT IN ISLAM,
Sufi M. R. Bengalee, M.A.,
56 E, Congress St., Suite 1307,
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. America.

(3) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Commercial Road, Salt Pond,
Gold Coast, West Africa.

(4) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Rose Hill, Mauritius.

(5) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
25-27, Alof Street, Okepopo, Lagos,
Nigeria, W. Africa.

(6) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Box No. 305, G. P. O.
Perth, W. Australia.

(7) THE CENTRAL (E.A.) AHMADIYYA
MUSLIM ASSOCIATION,
P. O. Box No. 554, Nairobi
(Kenya Colony.)

(8) MAULVI ABUL 'ATA, Maulvi Fazil,
Sharial Burj, Haifa, Palestine.

(9) MAULVI RAHMAT ALI, Oetœsan Ahmadiah,
Defensielijn V/d Bosch, No. 139, Batavia Centrum, Java.

(10) MAULVI MOHD. SADIQ, H.A., Oetœsan Ahmadiah,.
Padang—(Sumatra)

Regd. No. L.-2942

Digitized by Khilafat Library Rabwah

THE

REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

(A MONTHLY JOURNAL)

OF SANE RELIGIOUS MUSLIM THOUGHT

DEVOTED TO

THE DIFFUSION AND DISSEMINATION

OF

THE BEAUTIES AND EXCELLENCES

OF

ISLAMIC TEACHING & TORCH-BEARER

OF

THE LIGHT OF ISLAM IN THE WEST.

Gives an Impartial Review of the Prominent Religions of the World and Removes Misconceptions about ISLAM.

Annual Subscription ... *Rs. 4*

All remittances should be sent to the MANAGER,

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS (English)

P. O. Qadian, Punjab (India)

Printed at the Ripon Printing Press, Bull Road, Lahore, by Mirza Mohd. Sadiq, and published by Sheikh Abdur Rahman Qadiani for Sadar Anjuman-i-Ahmadiya, Qadian, Punjab, India.